

Remarks

Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the present amendment is respectfully requested.

Claims 29-41 have been canceled.

Turning to the rejections, it is respectfully submitted that the proffered rejections do not provide the present claimed invention.

Turning to independent claim 1, the claim was rejected in view of an asserted combination of a patent to Assa (U.S. Patent No. 6,612,335) in view of a patent to Blower (U.S. Patent No. 3,850,265). Turning to the particulars of Office action, the Office action states that the Assa patent shows the claimed device except for a transparent feature. The Office action then proffers the Blower patent as providing a teaching to utilize transparent plastics. However, it should be appreciated that the Assa patent provides negative teaching away from such modifications suggested by the Examiner. In particular, it should be noted that the device of the Assa patent is shown in the drawings as being made of metal. Specifically, the body 12 and the cover 28 of the Assa device are shown to be made fo metal as indicated by the section lines that are for metal. Moreover, the background of the invention section of the Assa patent clearly provides a negative teaching away from the use of plastic materials. Specifically, the Assa patent, at column 1, lines 38-40, states that the use of plastic material is eliminated. Accordingly, the person of ordinary skill in the art would naturally be led away from the use of plastic material including transparent plastic material based upon this negative teaching alone.

Moreover, the Blower patent provides a specific indication with regard to how plastic material is used. Specifically, the Blower patent, at column 2, line 64, states that the material, be it plastic or metal, is to be machined. As shown within the device of the Blower patent, such machining is accomplished due to the right angle configuration of the components. Moreover, such an approach would appear to provide such adequate strength for use of plastic. However, it would not be possible to machine the device of the Assa patent regardless of the material to be used. Moreover, as discussed above, the use of plastics is to be eliminated for the Assa

Appl. No. 10/753,242
Amdt dated December 2, 2005
Reply to Office action of September 2, 2005

device and thus the possible benefits provided by machining as discussed by Blower are not amendable to the Assa device. Accordingly, the person of ordinary skill in the art would again be led away from the asserted modification presented by the Examiner. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable. In view of the allowance of claim 1, all of the claims (2-14) are allowable.

Turning to independent claim 15, the Office action has proffered a combination of three patents (the Assa patent, the Blower patent and a patent to Morris, U.S. Patent No. 6,085,780). First, it should be appreciated that this rejection suffers the same problems as set forth in the discussion for claim 1 because of the incompatibility of the teachings of the underlined combination of Assa and Blower. These problems are compounded by the asserted addition of the Morris patent. It is to be noted that the Morris patent teaches that the key nuts 28 are to be capped in place (see the Morris patent at column 3, line 7). However, this is contrary to the machining that is to be done as taught by the Blower patent. Accordingly, the Morris patent does not cure the deficiency present in the underlining combination of Assa and Blower, and actually adds to the negative teaching that would dissuade the person of ordinary skill in the art from even proceeding from such a combination. Accordingly, claim 15 is allowable. Moreover, the claims 16-28 which depend from claim 15 are allowable.

With regard to infinite claim 42, the same issues arise as were presented for claims 15 above. Accordingly, claim 42 is similarly allowable.

If there are any further fees resulting from this communication, please charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, Order No. 35571.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON LLP



Ronald M. Kachmarik, Reg. No. 34512

1801 East 9th Street, Ste. 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
216-579-1700
December 2, 2005